

Amdt. dated October 4, 2004  
Reply to Office action of July 2, 2004

Serial No. 10/027,562  
Docket No. SVL920010004US1  
Firm No. 0055.0047

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner rejected claims 5-8, 13, 14, 21-24, 29, 30, 37-40, 45, and 46 as indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112, par. 2. Applicants have canceled claims 5-8, 21-24, and 37-40. Applicants further amended claims 13, 14, 29, 30, 45, and 46 to remove the language, such as "metadata type" and "field type", that the Examiner objected. Accordingly, these claim cancellations and amendments overcome the indefiniteness rejections.

Further, claims 13, 14, 29, 30, 45, and 46 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of independent claims 1, 17, and 33, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed below.

The Examiner rejected pending claims 1, 3, 9, 11, 13, 14, 17, 19, 25, 27, 33, 35, 41, and 43 as anticipated by Nelson (35 U.S.C. §102(e)). Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

Amended claims 1, 17, and 33 concern storing data in a data store and require: receiving a multimedia file including essence, metadata objects providing information on the essence, and a unique identifier assigned to the essence; extracting the essence from the file; storing the essence in the data store; for each received metadata data object in the first file, performing: determining whether the metadata object includes a label or attribute of a label; adding a tagged element to a metadata file corresponding to the label metadata if the metadata object includes one label; and adding a tagged attribute to the metadata file if the metadata object includes one attribute for one label, wherein the tagged attribute indicates an attribute value for one tagged element corresponding to the label for which the value is provided; and storing the metadata file in the data store.

Applicants amended the claims to clarify that the received file comprises a multimedia file and that for each received metadata data object in the multimedia file, performing: determining whether the metadata object includes a label or attribute of a label; adding a tagged element to a metadata file corresponding to the label metadata if the metadata object includes one label; and adding a tagged attribute to the metadata file if the metadata object includes one attribute for one label, wherein the tagged attribute indicates an attribute value for one tagged element corresponding to the label for which the value is provided.

Amdt. dated October 4, 2004  
Reply to Office action of July 2, 2004

Serial No. 10/027,562  
Docket No. SVL920010004US1  
Firm No. 0055.0047

The Examiner cited col. 4, line 59 to col. 5, line 48 of Nelson as disclosing the requirements of the pre-amended version of the independent claims. (Office Action, pg. 3) Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

The cited cols. 4-5 of Nelson discuss how a media file is received and header information is extracted from the media file to store in a database with server information and other media metadata. The header information may then be sent to a requesting client system to distribute the processing load. Upon the server side receiving a request from the client side for playback of a media file, quick access may be provided to header information stored in cache.

Although the cited Nelson discusses how header information included with a media file may be stored in a database separate from the media file, nowhere does the cited Nelson anywhere disclose the specific added claim requirements that for each metadata object in the received multimedia file performing: determining whether the metadata object includes a label or attribute of a label; adding a tagged element to a metadata file corresponding to the label metadata if the metadata object includes one label; and adding a tagged attribute to the metadata file if the metadata object includes one attribute for one label, wherein the tagged attribute indicates an attribute value for one tagged element corresponding to the label for which the value is provided

There is no mention anywhere in the cited Nelson of mapping header information to tagged elements or tagged attributes depending on whether the header information includes a label or attribute of a label as claimed.

Accordingly, amended independent claims 1, 17, and 33 are patentable over the cited art because the cited Nelson does not disclose all the claim requirements.

Applicants submit that dependent claims 3, 9, 11, 13, 14, 19, 25, 27, 35, 41, and 43 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 17, and 33, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Further, claims 3, 9, 11, 13, 14, 19, 25, 27, 35, 41, and 43 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because they include further requirements concerning the tagged elements and attributes in the metadata file which are nowhere disclosed in the cited Nelson because Nelson nowhere discloses a metadata file storing header information as tagged elements and attributes as claimed.

Amdt. dated October 4, 2004  
Reply to Office action of July 2, 2004

Serial No. 10/027,562  
Docket No. SVL920010004US1  
Firm No. 0055.0047

The Examiner rejected claims 10, 12, 26, 28, 42 and 44 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Nelson in view of the admitted prior art in the Background Section (page 1 to page 2, line 17 of the Application). Applicants traverse.

Claims 10, 12, 26, 28, 42 and 44 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 17, and 33, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims and requirements concerning tagged elements and attributes provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Applicants added claims 50-54. Applicants submit that these added claims are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 17, and 33, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above, and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

#### Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1, 3, 9-14, 17, 19, 25-30, 33, 35, 41-46, and 49-54 are patentable over the art of record. Applicants submit that no additional fee is needed for the claim amendments. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: October 4, 2004

By: 

David W. Victor  
Registration No. 39,867

#### Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor  
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP  
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210  
Beverly Hills, CA 90212  
Tel: 310-553-7977  
Fax: 310-556-7984